

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
ACTION

1154
1195
#6
1/20
See Bob Pastor's
comments attached.
us.

February 19, 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI
FROM: THOMAS THORNTON
SUBJECT: Chile and Argentina (U)

I sent you a memo for the VBB last Thursday on Chile and Argentina (attached). I understand that it was decided that State and DOD should battle the UNITAS issue out on their own. They have not come to a conclusion and David Newsom wants us to take a position and, presumably, decide the issue. I continue to recommend the following (please check your concurrence as appropriate):

1. Agree to UNITAS for Argentina.

Yes No _____

2. Disapprove UNITAS for Chile.
(C)

Yes No _____

There is also an issue between State on (would you believe) whether or not a DOD cartographer's slot should be abolished as part of the Letelier crackdown. This is a matter of massive inconsequence from any point of view. Since DOD has taken a longer cut in percentage terms than other Embassy elements (and we would be scrubbing UNITAS for Chile) I suggest that we back DOD on this matter. Concur?
(C)

Yes No _____

There is also the question of visits left over from the VBB although I don't think this is particularly contentious. Do you concur that:

1. Allen should be allowed to visit Argentina? Yes No _____

2. The Galtieri invitation should be delayed?
(C) Yes No _____

I still think the larger issue (discussed on page 2 of attached memo) needs resolution. If you do not want to burden the VBB with it, please let me know your preferences. Should we:

Substantially consider the Letelier phase over? _____ | avoid
_____ | having
_____ | to take
_____ | a position

Continue to take follow-up actions influenced by it? _____ | (C) |
_____ |
_____ |
_____ |

Attachment: February 13 V-B-B Memorandum

cc: Robert Pastor

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Review on Feb. 19, 1986

Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP

Change to

(1) Release () Excise () Deny () Declassify
Exemptions b () () E.O. 13526 25x () ()

Declassify after _____

With concurrence of:

obtained _____ not obt. Date 12-14-16

IPS by *[Signature]*

Outside the System

Chron

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

February 13, 1980

#6A

CONFIDENTIAL

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR: ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI

FROM: THOMAS THORNTON

SUBJECT: V-B-B Lunch -- Latin American Issues

DOD may bring up two Southern Cone issues:

1. Should the Argentinian Army Chief be invited to the US and our Chief of Air Staff go to Argentina?
2. Should we invite Chile and Argentina to participate in the annual UNITAS naval exercises? (C)

On the first point, I am in no tearing rush to issue the invitation -- the idea for which apparently came out of the Goodpaster mission. Even assuming that we want to invite Galtieri, I would want to hold off until we are sure that he does not appear as a human rights villain in the upcoming Interamerican Human Rights report. The visit of GEN Allen to Argentina (a tag-on to an already scheduled visit to Brazil) seems unobjectionable. I think that both of these visits would, however, be too much. Recommendation: O.K. for Allen; hold off on Galtieri for a while.

On the UNITAS maneuvers, I don't think that Argentina poses a problem. I understand that they have routinely participated in the past -- it makes no sense to cut them out now after (a) there has been some human rights improvement and (b) Goodpaster has been there. Derian wants to punish them for being uncooperative with us at the UNHRC meeting at Geneva.. This is not the instrument that I would use if, indeed, we want to show our displeasure. (C)

The Chile/UNITAS question is less clearcut. DOD wants to go ahead. The State position will be that we should not let the Chileans participate this year as one more punishment for the Letelier affair. I find that reasonable although it does raise a larger problem (see below). Recommendation: Yes on Argentina, No on Chile, keyed specifically to the Letelier case. I would not argue, however, if you decided otherwise on Chile. (C)

CONFIDENTIAL

Review on Feb. 13, 1986

~~Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP~~

~~Change to~~

~~(Release () Excise () Deny () Declassify~~

~~Exemptions b () () E.O. 13526 25x () () ()~~

~~Declassify after _____~~

~~With concurrence of:~~

~~IPS by _____ obtained _____ not obt.~~

~~Date 12-14-16~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

2

The Larger Issue

The President authorized a number of steps in the Letilier case and these have been taken (or are about to be taken). The question arises as to whether we want to continue punishment of the Chileans on this issue. Do we want this to be a time-limited action or is it supposed to remain a semi-permanent factor in US-Chilean relations? The UNITAS issue is one example and there will be some others coming up shortly. My preference is to put the issue behind us -- the UNITAS decision would be our last one under its influence -- and judge future issues in US-Chilean relations on the basis of their merits and overall Chilean behavior. It is possible, however, that you, Vance and even the President may want to come down harder and more lastingly on the Chileans. If so, the bureaucracy needs guidance. (C)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- A. That you raise with Vance (and later, if necessary, the President) the question of whether we want to keep the pressure on the Chileans over the Letilier case or consider actions under it to be completed.
- B. That you take the latter position in the discussion.
- C. That you let me know the outcome. (C)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

#6B

MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

February 20, 1980

INFORMATION

ZB HAS SEEN

MEMORANDUM FOR:

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI

FROM:

ROBERT PASTOR *RP*

SUBJECT:

Comments on Thornton's Memo on Chile (U)

Let me briefly comment on an important issue Tom raises in his memo:

"Should we consider the Letelier phase over?" The President made his decision to adopt a cool posture to Chile in late October; and in late November, the decisions were announced in a strong statement condemning Chilean government complicity in a heinous crime of international terrorism. I would pose Tom's question differently: How much staying power does the USG have? I think it would be a terrible embarrassment to the President if we proceeded with "business as usual," such as suggested by the UNITAS exercise, four months after he announces a strong and firm policy. (C)

With Mark Schneider running Kennedy's campaign, you can be absolutely certain that a decision to put the "Letelier phase" behind us and proceed with UNITAS will be noticed. And Kennedy is hungry for issues. Moreover, there is no good reason for us to go ahead with UNITAS; we are hardly in danger of losing Chile to anyone but the militarists. (C)

While I agree with Tom that the question of whether or not a DOD cartographer's slot should be abolished is an unimportant matter, Tom neglects to mention that one of the President's decisions was to reduce the size of our own mission. If all of us agree that this slot is unnecessary, then to be consistent with the President's decision it should be abolished. I see no reason why we should back DOD on this matter. (C)

cc: Tom Thornton

~~Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRF~~

~~Change to _____
 Release () Excise () Deny () Declassify
 Exemptions b () () E.O. 13526 25x () ()~~

~~Declassify after _____~~~~With concurrence of: _____~~

~~obtained _____ not obt.
 IPS by *[initials]* Date 12/14/80~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Review 2/20/1990

Extended by Z. Brzezinski

Reason: NSC 1.13(f)

ID 8001154

NSC/S PROFS

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~RECEIVED 19 FEB 80 18
#6C

TO BRZEZINSKI FROM THORNTON DOCDATE 19 FEB 80

KEYWORDS: CHILE ARGENTINA

SUBJECT: VBB

ACTION: FOR DECISION DUE: 21 FEB 80 STATUS FILES

FOR ACTION

FOR COMMENT

FOR INFO

PRZEZINSKI

PASTOR

~~Department of State, A/GIS/IPS/SRP~~

Change to _____
 Release () Excise () Deny () Declassify
 Exemptions b () () E.O. 13526 25x ()()
 Declassify after _____
 With concurrence of:

COMMENTS

REF #

LOG

8001155

NSCIF ID

(T /)

[Signature] obtained _____ not obt.
 IPS by *[Signature]* Date *12-14-10*

ACTION OFFICER (S) ASSIGNED ACTION REQUIRED DUE COPIES TO

C 2/21 2B approved record RP, JG

Carter Lib

RFC 7

Box 32

Luncheon Meeting (BBV), 1-4/80